UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Religion as Experience and Science as Criticism

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

The Story of Why Conscription Was Not Adopted in Australia

By JOHN P. FLETCHER

Canadian People to be Consulted Before War

By WILLIAM IVENS

VOLUME XCVI NUMBER 19

Chicago, January 25, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES *: Editors :* FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) .....

Address .....

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 291
Religion as Experience and Science as Criticism —CLARENCE R. SKINNER 293
Jottings—J. H. H. 295

ARTICLES—
Peace—FRANK C. DOAN 291
The Story of Why Conscription was not Adopted in Australia—JOHN P. FLETCHER .. 296
Canadian People to be Consulted before War—WILLIAM IVENS 299
The Abraham Lincoln Centre Ideal—CURTIS W. REESE 300
Moments—F. A. S. 300

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Galsworthian Drama—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 301
Race Prejudice—MARY WHITE OVINGTON 301
The Gentle Art of War—F. C. S. 301
Tabloid Reviews—CURTIS W. REESE 302

POETRY—
Leisure Hours—*Pei, Tieh* 298
A Stranger in Scythopolis—KATHARINE LEE BATES 302

CORRESPONDENCE—
Opposed to Enlarging UNITY—PETER FIEBIGER 303

THE FIELD—
Liberal Activities—*The Arbitrator* 303
League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment 303
To the Friends and Well Wishers of Russian Children 303
Books Received 304

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVI MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1926 NUMBER 19

PEACE

We all want peace of mind and quietness of spirit. The trouble is we are unwilling to pay the price. We spend our days pursuing phantoms, scratching for food and raiment, scrambling for position, fighting for power. Scurrying about, flurrying, hurrying, worrying. And then when the day is done, the hot feverish day, we wonder that we are weary and restless and unquiet all the night long! Foolish, foolish men that we should go on in this way of turbulence. The path of peace is for him only whose meat and drink is to serve his fellow-men. Ah! just think for once how few are the needs of the man who lives for the things that bring lasting joy! A little simple food; one garment or two; a few books and pictures, but these of the best; a host of friends, but these kept without flattery or dissimulation; a quiet home. That is all. With these few things a man is equipped for life. And the way of that man shall be peace and quietness forever.

FRANK C. DOAN.

We had the idea, when the easy-going Harding died and the impeccable Coolidge took his place, that the corruption rampant in the government would be cleaned up, or the evidences of it removed at least. That big business would be granted all the favors desired, as in the lowering of taxes on large incomes, for example, we took for granted; but sheer rottenness, we felt sure, would disappear. The attitude of President Coolidge toward the oil scandals was our first disappointment. Promising that no guilty man would escape, the President stood by his guilty cabinet officers until, in sheer decency or fear of public anger, they themselves resigned. Appointing special counsel to prosecute the cases, the President acquiesces in a policy of masterful inactivity which sees nothing done after more than a year of time. The unspeakable Fall is still at large, the notorious oil-magnates are carrying on prosperous business at the old stand. As a second disappointment and disillusionment was the brazen attempt of Calvin Coolidge to appoint Mr. Warren to the head of the Judiciary Department, an attempt fortunately defeated by an alert and conscientious Senate. Now comes the prodigious scandal of the Aluminum Trust, with the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice and the Secretary of the Treasury all mixed up in one of the sorriest messes on record. Added to this are the income tax scandals unearthed by Senator Couzens. Not to be forgotten is the indictment of the Alien Property Custodian, Colonel Miller, the revelations of airplane graft, and the unimaginable corruption in so-called prohibition enforcement. Never in our history has government been so "rotten" as it is today. And the worst of it is that nobody cares. Courts, lawyers, newspapers, the general public, all are supremely indifferent. Everybody is making money; officers of government must of course have their share; there is a traditional way of getting it, so, why complain? It's all very lovely for those on the inside. But such things bring their day of reckoning, and when it comes we shall not envy the name of Calvin Coolidge.

The state of mind of our anti-Prohibitionists, the arguments which they use, the conclusions to which they come, are more than we can understand. Like the flight of an eagle or the ways of a woman, as the wise men used to put it, these things are past finding out. Thus, they want the 18th Amendment, or at least the Volstead Act, repealed. Why? Because it is being violated and is therefore making law ridiculous. But who are violating it and thus making law ridiculous? *Those who want it repealed!* Think over that succession of sentences for a minute and then see if you understand what it means in terms of public policy! Suppose you don't like certain laws—traffic regulations, laws against forgery or theft, prohibition laws against opium or brothels. What shall you do? According to our "wets," you should violate these laws. This will triumphantly establish the argument that the laws in question are unenforcible and are thus bringing all law and order into contempt. This fact being established, it follows, according to anti-Prohibition logic, that the laws should be repealed. The lawlessness of the speed maniac is therefore an unanswerable argument for the repeal of all our traffic regulations. The alarming success of our bandits in New York, Chicago and elsewhere these days, presents a perfect demonstration that all laws against robbery should be forthwith erased from the statute-books. Our opium smugglers are not criminals at all; on the contrary, they are high-minded citizens who are proving that all laws against the opium traffic are futile and therefore should be quashed. Analyzed in this fashion, the position of our anti-Prohibitionists is seen to be exactly what it really is—utterly fantastic and contemptible. Just so long as they are the breakers of the law which they would have repealed, their word, like their example, is of none effect. If they would be listened to at all, they must first themselves obey the Prohibition Amendment, and thus prove their fidelity to the standards of law and order for which they express such concern.

Some day we are going to write a book, or a sermon, or an essay, or a magazine article, or an editorial, or

something else, on the subject of "the next step." Of all the silly fallacies to which the human mind is prone, this seems to us to be the silliest, as it is certainly one of the most common. Any and every so-called reform of no particular efficacy or wisdom is urged on the ground that it is a "next step," to the complete neglect of the fact that such a step is important only if it is in the direction of the goal we are seeking. Most so-called "next steps," as a matter of fact, are not in that direction at all, since men are willing to go almost anywhere except ahead. Heywood Broun, of the New York *World,* has recently pointed out this truth in a little controversy with John Farrar, of the *Bookman,* who has been urging men to read Edgar Guest and Zane Grey as a first or next step to reading ultimately such authors as Shelley and Thackeray. Mr. Broun objects, on what seems to us to be the sensible ground that the literary tendencies represented by Guest and Shelley, for example, do not run in the same direction at all. "Guest lives 'way down town," says Mr. Broun—and Shelley as 'way up town! If a man wants to reach Shelley, therefore, the last thing in the world that he wants to do is to read Guest. As a "next step," such procedure is fatal. This fallacy of the "next step" appears in weightier and more immediately practical matters than literature. John Dewey, some two years or so ago, showed that it vitiated the whole argument for the World Court and the League of Nations. These are important, say their advocates, not because they are perfect or final, but because they are "next steps." Not at all, said Dewey! Men have always been taking next steps of this kind—Holy Alliances, Hague Courts, etc. —and they have never gotten anywhere. The trouble is that all these "next steps" have been *inside* the war system. Any "next step," to be effective, must be *outside* the war system altogether. The repudiation or outlawry of war, in other words, is the only "next step" worth while. That, at least, is in the right direction!

The 29th day of this month marks the sixtieth birthday anniversary of Romain Rolland, born in 1866 at Clamecy, in Burgundy, the scene of his charming novel, "Colas Breugnon." This is an occasion which will be marked with acclaim and reverence throughout the world by those who have come to know the greatness of the spirit who moves among us—Rolland's place in literature is of course secure. The Nobel Prize, awarded for the incomparable achievement of "Jean Christophe," but anticipates that final verdict of posterity which will enroll its author among the great literary geniuses of all time. But already, before its preeminence as a work of art had been generally recognized, this stupendous novel had found its way to sensitive hearts everywhere as a prophetic message for the future. An unforgettable interpretation of the early twentieth-century Europe, so discerning as to uncover the war which was germinating at its heart, "Jean Christophe" was at the same time a presentation of that free, universal spirit of modern life and culture which was at that time fighting for the mastery of the European mind and ultimately the salvation of that mind to brotherhood and peace. With the war itself, Rolland became something more than the artist or even prophet. In his own person he became the incarnation of that European mind, that all-embracing human spirit, of which he had written, and which now refused to die or disappear amid the clash of arms. Alone at this dreadful time Romain Rolland perpetuated the humanitarian ideal, slowly rallying to his high standard the faithful souls of all nations who believed still in the spirit. "Above the Battle" and the "Fore-Runners" are the record of this period, as "Clerambault" is its final summary. What Rolland did during the Great War is one of the climactic chapters in the history of the human soul. More than any one man of our time he saved the western world from spiritual death. Today, in exile, he sees himself vindicated of all he said and did. From the beginning he saw the truth about the war, and pointed the way to the sole pathway of escape from its destruction. Because of Romain Rolland, we dare still to cherish hope of Europe and the future. May he live long enough into that future to see all mankind kneeling in reverent recognition before him!

"Honor" is a great and noble word. Yet to what petty and ignoble uses it has been prostituted! In relations between individuals it has been dedicated to the protection or vindication of every basest form of jealousy, pride, selfishness, passion, and violence. A "man of honor," so-called, has been at times a cad, a boaster, a bully and a murderer. His "code of honor," so-called, has been the occasion of every manner of meanness, spite and cruelty. Sir Walter Scott tells the truth of it in "Rob Roy," through the mouth of his immortal Baillie Nicol Jarvie—"I maun hear naething about honor. . . . Honor is a homicide and a bloodspiller, that gangs about making frays in the street." Thanks to change of manners, advance of education, the abolishment of duelling, etc., this dishonorable "honor" is rapidly disappearing from the ways of men. The quality is rarely found today except in the gambling den, at the race track, and in the parlors of social snobbery. But what has thus withered and died in the character and conduct of individual men, is flourishing in full flower in relations between nations: "National honor," so-called, is now the camouflage for every imaginable form of falsehood, dishonesty, banditry and armed violence. A nation's "honor" is simply a nation's arrogance, a nation's jealousy, a nation's thievery, a nation's determination to serve its own selfish interests at no matter what cost of comfort, peace and happiness for the rest of humankind. Let a nation

announce, in any international dispute, that its "honor" is involved, and it is certain that there is some dishonor to be concealed or carried through. Let a nation appeal to arms and declare war in the name of "honor" and we may know without further evidence that the freebooter is organizing his gang for some deed of plunder. With nations today, as with individuals yesterday, "honor is a homicide and a bloodspiller, that gangs about making frays" on the seas and lands of all the world. Yet the word itself is still a great and noble one!

There is much in religion that is unknown and unknowable. Religion moves in the realm of the mysterious, and mounts naturally into the lofty spaces of the invisible. But there are many things in religion, especially in the thought of religion as it touches on matters of theological speculation and historical investigation, which are not unknown at all. They are not even uncertain. On the contrary, they are as positive to any informed, intelligent and scientifically trained mind as the movement of the earth around the sun. Thus we know that Jesus was not born of a virgin, exactly as we know that any other character of history was not so born. We know that Jesus did not rise from the dead, else are all fables true and all legends credible. We know that the Bible is not a unique and infallible revelation of God, as surely as we know that Homer, the orations of Cicero, and the "Imitation of Christ" are not such a revelation. We know that all forms of life, including man, have evolved from earlier and simpler forms through a period of years numbering tens of millions, or we know nothing at all. These and similar things we *know* as a part of the ordered knowledge of the world. Yet is it practically impossible to get a categorical opinion on any of these subjects from those who inherit and desire to perpetuate in any form the traditions of orthodox Christianity. Almost always there is explanation, evasion, equivocation. Words suddenly mean what they have never meant before in any other place. Dogmas formulated in ancient days to express perfectly precise ideas, now unexpectedly take on the aspect of symbols and allegories. Historical and scientific statements of centuries ago, wholly out of accord with the ways of thought and data of knowledge today, are quickly shown to be ineffably precious as expressions or revelations of human psychology. Thus is the issue of simple truth dodged! Thus is an honest, clean, straightforward answer avoided! Yet it was Jesus himself who commanded his disciples, "Let your communications be Yea, yea, Nay, nay."

Religion as Experience and Science as Criticism

I.

In the confusion between religion and science, one fact should stand crystal clear; namely, that religion as such deals with a human experience; in fact, religion *is* that experience, nothing more, nothing less. No reasonable person can deny that this experience exists, and that it is its own validity.

We have long recognized that "beauty is its own excuse for being." The fact of appreciating loveliness in form or color is an age-old fact of human nature. The praises of this experience have been sung and still are sung, and will continue to be the theme of men's lyric outpourings as long as a man and a star shall last. "Truth is beauty, beauty is truth."

So with religion. Man, facing his universe from earliest time to eldest time, reacts in the way we define as religious. Religion is thus unshakable. It outlasts schools of thought and turns of political fortune. A thousand scientific theories become antique, while worship, reverence, faith are as fresh as the unfolding of each new day. Like love, they are discoveries made anew by each generation and, like love, bring with them argosies of spiritual wealth. The sense of mystery, the marvels of life, the grandeur of the infinite, the dignity of man when he feels the tides of the universal sweep through him—these are the stuff of the religious experience.

For illustration we might use a few examples from different spheres of life, separated by time and customs, and in these examples search for that experience which we maintain is its own validity.

First, let us turn to the poet Wordsworth, and read his familiar lines:

> I have felt
> A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things.

Can anyone read this passage without knowing that a sensitive mind here makes articulate for the world one of the most sublime experiences of which human nature is capable? There pulses through every one of these lines the sense of reality. Surely these sentiments are not woven out of "airy nothings," mere gossamer stuff of phantasy. Wordsworth felt something; he was deeply moved; and because of this experience his life was deeper, his aspiration loftier. In this experience we are dealing with something absolutely elemental and unshakable. As he stood on the banks of the Wye, a few miles above Tintern Abbey, gazing at a sight which held associations of the most intimate kind, he realized an integration of himself, the scene, and the

whole meaning and movement of life. The infinite moved in upon him, and he expanded outward toward the infinite. He felt reverence and exaltation and deep gratitude. It is a "blessed mood" which has power to bring serenity and poise. Many a time "when the fretful stir unprofitable, and the fever of the world" hang heavy upon him, the remembrance of that mood lifts the "heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world," and he becomes in truth a "living soul."

Such an experience is the very heart and core of religion. It stands deeply rooted in unshakable reality. No matter what our interpretation or explanation may be, here is a fact of human nature which is valid, and "its own excuse for being."

Another illustration of religious experience, taken from another type of person, one of the most sensitive and genuine souls known to history, is the case of Henri Frederic Amiel, Swiss philosopher and author of the famous "Journal Intime." He had been spending a certain day in reading various philosophical works, and his mind was roused to a high pitch of excitement. In the evening he laid aside his books and allowed his emotions and thoughts to have full sway with him, and this is what he writes in his diary:

> I have traversed the universe from the deepest depths of the empyrean to the peristaltic movements of the atoms in the elementary cell. I have felt myself expanding in the infinite, and enfranchised in spirit from the bounds of time and space, able to trace back the whole boundless creation to a point without dimensions, and seeing the vast multitude of suns, of milky ways, of stars, and nebulæ, all existent in the point.
>
> And on all sides stretched mysteries, marvels and prodigies, without limit, without number, and without end. I felt the unfathomable thought of which the universe is the symbol live and burn within me; I touched, proved, embraced! my nothingness and my immensity. Such moments are glimpses of the divine. They make one conscious of one's immortality; they bring home to one that an eternity is not too much for the study of the thoughts and works of the eternal. They awaken in us an adoring ecstasy and the ardent humility of love.

Here, again, we are dealing with an experience which bears every evidence of a genuine reality. No honest person who has read Amiel's Journal can doubt that this heroic soul was, to the best of his ability, transcribing to the pages of his book, a fiery, passionate moment of his life, when he was "loos'd of imaginary limits, when the universal tides came flooding through his whole being, and when his thought and emotion went out from the narrow self, to the uttermost bounds of space and time. Here, surely, is no pose, nor merely literary gesture. No one can conceive that Amiel, a zealous disciple of truth, was merely embroidering a pattern of words, for the words' sake. Everyone can feel the pulse, the lift of the mood which was his. It may be that such sweep of the imagination, such tenderness of devotion, and loftiness of conception are rare, but they are the heart of religion. They lead us into the depths of mystery, and the true glory of human significance. If such experience is rare, so much the worse for man, for as Samuel Taylor Coleridge says:

> 'Tis the sublime of man
> Our noontide majesty, to know ourselves
> Parts and proportions of one wondrous whole!

Explanations may enlighten and make intelligible, but they do not supplant or alter the authentic fact of Amiel's exaltation.

Another instance, better known and more influential, is that of Tolstoy, whose experience caused a complete revolution in his own life, and also led multitudes to revalue and redirect their own lives. At the beginning of his essay, "My Religion," he says:

> My whole life underwent a sudden transformation. What I had once wished for I wished for no longer. What had once appeared to me good now became evil, and the evil of the past I beheld as good.
>
> My condition was like that of a man who goes forth on some errand, and suddenly on the way decides that the matter is of no importance, and returns home. What was at first on his right hand is now on his left, and what was at his left hand is now on his right . . . The direction of my life and my desires were completely changed; good and evil had changed places. . . .
>
> Like the thief on the cross, I believed in the doctrine of Christ, and was saved. This is not a vain comparison, but a most accurate expression of my spiritual condition of horror and despair in the presence of life and death, in which I found myself formerly, and of that condition of happiness and peace in which I find myself now.

As in the previous instances of Wordsworth and Amiel, can anyone doubt that we are here dealing with an experience which has every evidence of the most genuine reality? Tolstoy's life from the time of his conversion to his death is an eloquent testimony to the power and transforming character of that experience.

Here is a man who admits that he had led a profligate life, a life of vanity, selfishness and injustice, dominated by so-called worldly interests. Then follows a period of doubt and struggle in which he is bewildered, torn apart, miserable and lost. He loses all courage and has no interest in living. He would commit suicide if he were not too cowardly to face it. All meaning of life is gone, all purpose gone, he wanders about aimlessly, groping in the night.

Then comes the experience of religion. In his own words he says:

> It was an experience similar to that which might happen to a man who, following an erroneous model, should try to find the meaning of a heap of intermingled fragments, and should suddenly, by means of one large fragment, come to the conclusion that it was an entirely different statue from what he had supposed it to be; then beginning to fashion it anew, instead of the former incoherent mass of pieces, he would find, as he observed the outlines of each fragment, that all fitted well together and formed one consistent whole, and he would be amazed at the confirmation of his thought.

Suddenly meaning emerges out of chaos. He finds the key which unlocks the problems of life, and immediately a new zest for life awakens, a new strength and courage are born. Tolstoy discovers faith, and faith restores in him joy and peace; it is the fragment which gives a new interpretation to the chaotic mass of events called life. It is the force which makes it possible to go on the way, because it inspires with the conviction that there is cause and effect, stability and dependability in the universe.

Such an experience is beyond all question or doubt a reality; it is true; nothing can shake it.

One more illustration of religious experience, and we shall have sufficient data. Let us consider briefly one situation in the life of Jesus—his hours of testing and agony before his death. There have been many martyrs in history who have endured the seemingly impossible, but there are few whose death has been more completely tragic.

His nearest and dearest disciples misunderstood him up to the last moment of his life. They quarreled over who should be the first in the kingdom of God when he had spent his utmost energy in teaching them humility and service. They slept through the night watch when he was going through the terrific ordeal of his innermost soul. They denied that they had ever known him, when to admit their friendship meant suspicion and possible death. Misunderstood, forsaken, betrayed, defeated, as lonely as God, he struggled and fought. He cried out as a strong man, in the prime of life, would do, against this suffering. And yet, through all this ordeal, he was able to say, "Thy will, not mine, be done." In the awful hush under the stars or amidst the jeers and scoffings on the cross, he was sustained by an unfailing power which kept him gentle and forgiving. Not one word of bitterness crossed his lips, not one gesture of hate. Unsurrendered to the last, he went from strength to strength. His faith in the will of God turned all ignominy to triumph.

Well may Paul years later have written:

> Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Here in the life of Jesus we find again the unshakable reality of the religious experience. No one with the slightest particle of imagination or understanding can see that figure toiling up a long road to Calvary, struggling and sweating beneath the physical and symbolical burdens of the cross, without knowing that a whole universe of strength had entered into that life. Here indeed is man at perihelion! Here is majesty that brings us to our knees. Here is what religion can do when it is most truly understood and most nobly lived. In that experience we become more than conquerors.

Wherever religion is really lived, there comes new meaning and new zest for life, there dawns cosmic consciousness with its windows open to "the soul's divine surprise," there is born a new resource and power which make men strong with the strength of eternity. Wherever religion is really lived, there are intimations, hints of "the never yet explored," there is the golden sound of trumpets in the azure sky, rallying men to adventures new. Wherever religion is really lived there is man aspiring to be more than himself, a rebel against what has been for the hope of what may be.

It should clarify the issue in this age-old conflict between religion and science to remember that religion is eternally real because man really experiences it; that it is unshakably true, because man truly lives it.

The reality of religion may be sought in test-tube and in text-book, but it will be found only in the august lives of men.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER

(To be concluded)

Jottings

On Romain Rolland's sixtieth birthday (January 29th), it may be well to remember that he has written the best book extant on Mahatma Gandhi (See "Mahatma Gandhi," published by the Century Company). Rolland on Gandhi is a combination which, like a conjunction of two planets, comes only once in centuries.

The *Universalist Leader* has changed its name to the *Christian Leader,* thus following the excellent example of the *Christian Register,* the organ of the Unitarians. This is a real achievement, as getting rid of one more pernicious use of a denominational label.

Some weeks ago we inquired in this column as to what had become of the indictments against Senator Wheeler. It is pleasant to announce that these have now been all dismissed by the courts, and the Senator thus vindicated. Pleasant for Senator Wheeler and his friends—but what about the Department of Justice, which is thus proved to have conspired to ruin a great public servant without cause, and the people of the nation generally who have thus been betrayed by their own government?

Censors seem everywhere to have an infallible talent for being ridiculous. The Soviet censor in Russia is the latest. He has just banned Wagner's "Lohengrin," Massenet's "Werther," and Schiller's "Mary Stuart." We sympathize with the citizen of Moscow who, in answer to a newspaper's call for the nomination of the biggest Soviet fool, named the Censor.

Mussolini has one admirable quality, whatever his numerous faults. We refer to his frankness, which surpasses anything we have ever seen in any other public man. Take this statement, for example, from his preface to his Life as written by Sarfatti:

> In this book my life is to be found recorded—at least such part of it as can be made known, for every man has secrets and shady nooks that are not to be explored.

It is really much too soon yet to say what the War did to the world.—E. L. Martin, in *Life* (January 14, page 16).

Tell this to Germany, to Austria, to France, to England! Tell it to the millions of refugees who haunt the world, to the millions dead and the greater millions who mourn the dead! Tell it to the gods, and hear them laugh!

J. H. H.

The Story of Why Conscription Was Not Adopted in Australia

[The following article by John P. Fletcher, an English Quaker was written by request. It is intensely interesting, and points out the methods and principles by which anti-conscription victories may be won.—EDITOR]

I arrived in Adelaide, South Australia, on the last day of 1911. In 1909 the Parliaments of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa had quickly passed compulsory military training acts. It made no difference as to what the political character of the governments were —it was Labor in Australia, Conservative in New Zealand, Liberal in South Africa—the representatives had come home from the Imperial Conference with the bills in their pockets. William Morris Hughes had hobnobbed with Lord Roberts and other advocates of conscription in England, and in both the countries I know more particularly about—Australia and New Zealand —the bills were passed through Parliament with very little discussion and became law. The party newspapers, of course, supported them; the churches were allowed special training corps so that their boys need not be contaminated with the ordinary boy, and this combination of politicians, pressmen and preachers implied that this revolutionary change had been accepted by everyone.

In January, 1910, all boys of from 14 to 18 in Australia, were required to register themselves for military training, under penalty of £100 on themselves, and a similar penalty of £100 was threatened to each parent who influenced his boy not to register. There was practically a complete registration. The training started in July, 1910, and consisted of sixty-four hours military drill in the year, to be given in the evenings, Saturday afternoons and public holidays. Each year the boys of 18 passed out as citizen soldiers and they had then to perform a more intensive training, including a certain amount of time in camp. It was universal and compulsory. An early attempt was made to punish those who refused for one cause or another to attend drill, but this prosecution soon broke down through faulty wording of the act. Until the end of the training year it could not be proved that a boy had not completed his number of drills of 64 hours in the year! It was possible for the whole amount to be made up, if the necessary facilities were given, right up to the last week.

When I arrived in Australia, I found that the only people openly opposed to the whole scheme were the Quakers numbering about 500, and the Australian Socialist party, a small Socialist group in Sidney and Melbourne, publishing a weekly paper. One had the impression of a small group of people just waiting for the blow to fall. We wondered what the penalty would be and how we should be able to stand out.. The whole of public opinion seemed against us.

The active opposition from the Quaker side came by the publication of the first pamphlet written by John F. Hills. To him more than to any other man is the credit of the movement, which grew with extraordinary rapidity, and which achieved remarkable success. During the Christmas holidays he had written a pamphlet which he called: "Child Conscription—Our Country's Shame." When it was published, he took steps to sell it, not only through various book stores and shops, several of which refused to take it, but on Saturdays he would himself sell it on the streets. As an instance of feeling on the part of the military authorities that the training was something especially sacred and should not be opposed, one military officer went to the owner of the book stall at Adelaide Railway Station, and told him to take down the placard advertising the pamphlet. The proprietor answered that when the officer himself owned the book stand, then he could say what should be sold; meanwhile he was going to sell what pamphlets he liked.

In March Henry Holland, the editor of the International Socialist, and leader of the Australian Socialist party in Sidney, was prosecuted for refusing to let his son drill. An experienced Socialist leader, Henry Holland, had been imprisoned for taking part in a strike, and had been discharged from prison ill. On his return home from the hospital, he found his boy's khaki uniform in the house. He promptly made the uniform into a parcel, wrote a letter to the commanding officer, and sent the uniform back, stating that he took the responsibility of preventing his boy from drilling. The government at once prosecuted, and demanded the maximum penalty of £100, which was inflicted. The report of this, widely published in the press, brought a seriousness into the situation. It was the first definite action taken against military conscription. Henry Holland is now leader of the Labor Party in the New Zealand Parliament.

On the approach of Easter, 1912, John Hills suggested that we take a caravan and drive through the country, selling and distributing his pamphlet and speaking against the conscriptive training, and asked me to go with him. Another friend, Thomas Hubbard, came too. But we did not get the caravan, as the distance between towns is so great, and we would have wasted time in traveling over unpopulated country. Instead, we went to the town of Gawler, a manufacturing town in the State, and spent the time there. We were prepared to pay all our own expenses, and two friends gave us one pound for anything extra. We took a tent and blankets, so that we should be at very little cost, and in this way the work started.

We interviewed all ministers of religion, and public men, and they, everyone of them, excused, if they did not support, the training. The typical answer of the ministers was, "It is a big question, and has two sides to it." We got permission from the mayor to hold an open-air meeting. We hired a farm cart and a very slow horse; we stenciled posters, and, decorating the cart, we drove up and down the town on a Saturday afternoon, announcing an open-air meeting that evening; while we distributed and sold what little literature we had. The public meeting was a good success, though the policeman, as we expected, was there. He first asked us if we had a permit to hold a meeting, and when we said "Yes," he said, "You men are doing a dangerous thing—you are talking against an act of Parliament." The meeting passed off very successfully with no opposition and some support. In talking it over with the ordinary man in the street, or rather with the woman at the house door, we estimated then that three-fourths of the people were against the training. They expressed surprise at our coming to talk about the thing, but we could see that the training was unpopular. A group of boys, especially, were interested, and soon

followed us around with great approval. The editor of the local paper was friendly, and gave us a good report.

We had all quite expected to have been arrested before we returned home. There is a sanctity about nationalism and militarism which puts it in a class by itself. The way in which the whole mass of people had accepted the training as something inevitable, and the universal support that it had from the so-called leaders, religious and political, produced a psychology in which we expected they would try to stop us from speaking openly against this sacred thing. But we arrived home safely. This was the beginning of the most extraordinary movement that I had, until then, ever been connected with. It grew with tremendous rapidity. The following Sunday we reported our success to the meeting of the Society of Friends—Quakers. Everyone in the group was very much moved; they decided to pay all our expenses, and to raise the necessary money to carry on further work. From that time on I gave my whole time to the work.

The movement just went by itself. We formed the Australian Freedom League, which comprised all kinds of people who were opposed to the training. Our first meeting was attended by about 30 people, and met in the Friends' meeting house. From then on we met nearly every week until the numbers were too large to meet in that room. We continued to hold meetings in Adelaide and throughout the State. Meetings were very simply arranged. I would go down to one of the suburbs on the morning of a particular day and hire a hall for the meeting on the following night. I would then return to Adelaide and get 4000 or 5000 hand-bills printed, and telephone to half a dozen friends to come down to the suburb and distribute them that same night, and the following night we would get an attendance of 100 to 300 people. Each meeting paid its own expenses; not that we asked for collection, but people in the meeting would come and give us money because they were so relieved that some group at last was in the open opposing the training. Names of sympathizers began to come in by the hundred. We could not understand this at all at first. The local papers ridiculed us and wrote periodic leading articles exactly in the same strain that the Chicago papers are now writing about the Northwestern University students, and that gave us the required publicity. But the movement moved. That was the chief thing.

After three weeks of such work in the State of South Australia, I had to leave to go to the general meeting of Friends in New Zealand. This enabled me to have meetings in Melbourne and Hobart on my way, which resulted in branches of the Australian Freedom League, being formed in the states of Victoria and Tasmania, and then on my return from New Zealand to Sidney, we started a branch in New South Wales. The Quakers were the nucleus of these branches in each case, but members of the Peace Society and of other groups joined in, and the movement very quickly spread. By the time of my return to Adelaide in June, the movement was well under way. Money came in quicker than we could spend it. Speakers of all kinds—religious, labor, political, of all parties—just offered themselves and arranged meetings for us.

We could not at first explain the success of the movement. The government and the military authorities kept protesting that the scheme was popular and that there was very little refusal to drill. We know, however, that the registration of the new quota, of the boys who became 14 in 1912, were 21,000 short. This meant that the people had had experience of what the training meant, and although there was no movement to support them at all, just 21,000 had failed to register. We believed that there was a great number of boys who had not made their drills. We knew of some, but just how large the number was, we did not know. At last the Minister of Defense announced that with only three weeks before the end of the year, there were 22,000 defaulters. Embarrassed by this huge number, he announced that special opportunities would be given to these boys to avoid punishment if they would even now complete their drills. Threats of the heaviest penalty were made, but at the end of the year the authorities had to announce that 18,000 boys had defaulted and that they would all be prosecuted.

And now began the active work of the League. Hundreds of boys were passed through police courts each week in every large city. They were at first sentenced to imprisonment, but there were so many of them that very soon another method was adopted. They were summoned before the court, and the magistrate was instructed to caution them, if they promised him that they would attend the drills, he adjourned the summons for three months to give them the opportunity. But he straightly threatened them that if they did fail to do their service, they would then be imprisoned in the fortress. In the first two years over 40,000 boys were brought before the courts, and over 4,000 of them were imprisoned, most of them for a month in fortresses and barracks. It can be imagined what strong feeling this aroused amongst the parents and friends of each boy. It must not be imagined that all of these boys were conscientious objectors,—that is, that they refused on principle to take part in war. Conscription was a new thing, and the boys were not going, at the end of a day's work, to give their time to irksome drill. In many cases, they were required to travel four miles to attend the drill. In many cases this was physically impossible at the end of a day's work for them to go the four miles in and four miles home again. They objected to giving up their sport, their games, on the Saturday afternoon, for the drill, or to give up their public holidays. Others refused to be ordered about by the drilling officer. A few were encouraged by their parents, or themselves had sufficient strength to refuse to have anything to do with the drill on conscientious grounds.

It was these few who finally broke this scheme down by refusing to drill, even when they were imprisoned in the fortresses. It took several such boys to suffer a fair amount of hardship, such as a week's imprisonment in a solitary cell on bread and water diet, before the facts of such treatment aroused Parliament to say that such treatment should cease. There was such indignation, on one occasion, that Labor Members were saying to their own government, "If you cannot carry on your system without tyrannical methods, then you must drop the system." The government had to promise that such punishment should cease, so the problem of how to deal with the conscientious objector had begun.

Meanwhile, the Australian Freedom League had increased tremendously in numbers and influence. Several parents had been fined and imprisoned for taking the responsibility of refusing to let their sons drill, and

this aroused strong indignation in each district. In the churches, in the trade unions, in the Labor and Liberal political parties, the movement developed and grew month by month. Large public meetings were arranged by the Australian Freedom League; large quantities of literature were issued in every State. In Adelaide with 140,000 population a house to house distribution of literature took place on one single night, and this resulted in the names of thousands of fresh supporters being received. A large public meeting was arranged for at Sidney, and three political leaders spoke. The Sidney Bulletin appeared the next week with a cartoon, which meant that we had reached front-page importance. The cartoon was called, "Three Men and a Mountain", and represented three Lilliputians hanging on to the end of a crowbar with which they were trying to shift the mountain of compulsory training. The mountain has been shifted.

The striking thing in the whole movement was the way in which, week by week, our movement, which started from one man, grew, while the thing to which we were opposed, appearing so strong, became ever weaker and weaker. Conscription was entirely opposed to the democratic purposes and principles of British speaking countries. The "white Australia" policy had logically led to conscription, and the democratic people had to choose which they would have—conscription which destroyed democracy, or democracy which destroyed conscription. The Labor party, being most democratic, was the first to change round, and by the summer of 1914 they had completely reversed their previous decisions; each one of the State parties demanding such drastic alterations of the conscription bill that it destroyed its conscriptive character. Those of us who were closest to the work, found it necessary to keep very clearly to the central principle, "No conscription." The militarists objected very strongly to its being called Conscription, but we gave definitions which fastened the name. We were continually asked to provide alternative schemes. "That is not for us to do", we said. "It is for you who believe such things are necessary, to find your way out of this difficulty. Conscription and democracy cannot go together. You have to choose which you will have."

I learned then what has guided me in my experience in England during the world war, that it is not for us to make any agreements with conscription. As with slavery, the principle is wrong, and we cannot make any compromise. At the meeting of the Friends in New Zealand which I attended in 1912, the matter came up for discussion. A Quaker deputation had seen the General responsible for establishing the scheme—General Godley sent over from England especially for the scheme. He said to the deputation, "Now, I understand your difficulties, and your position, and I am willing to meet you half way. I want to make this scheme work as smoothly as possible. Now how far will you meet me?" The Friends replied that they could not answer him themselves, but would discuss the matter at their General Meeting. At this meeting they said quite clearly that if the militarists liked to give up their principle half way, it was for them to please themselves, but that the Quakers held an entirely opposite principle, and they could not give up their principle even one-quarter of the way. It is this bringing the matter down to a principle of life, and not getting side-tracked into any compromised position, that is the salvation of any pacifist movement. It is those people who believe in government by force who must overcome the dilemma of using force in order to maintain liberty, or to preserve peace by means of war. The thing cannot be done, and the sooner the people get to know it, the sooner we shall get to a sound social life.

The war practically ended the Australian and New Zealand conscription scheme. All the boys who were imprisoned in fortresses were now discharged because the fortresses were being used for fear of the Germans, and all military activity was now engaged in preparing for the war. The insight which had been got into military methods, however, produced a strong criticism of military action on the part of prominent labor men. The military authorities had ceased to be sacred, rather they were very suspect. An active peace movement opposed to the war, at once came into being, and many public meetings were held. When it was proposed to supplement voluntary recruiting for the war by conscriptive methods, the Labor party strongly opposed, and forced the Prime Minister to take a referendum. The party opposed conscription and made it a party issue; all those who supported conscription were purged out. This turned out of the Party William Morris Hughes, Prime Minister, and the Labor Minister of Defence. Conscription failed, a large majority voting against it. Six months later Hughes said that the situation had changed, and he proposed a second referendum. This also was lost. I think it is clear that our work in the Australian Freedom League, which built up, in the two years before the war, a strong criticism and activity against militarism when the forces against us appeared overwhelming, was responsible for Australia being the only country in the World War that did not have conscription. The mountain had shifted.

The latest news that I have received, both from Australia and New Zealand, is that the training, though still carried on, is practically voluntary. The Labor party is officially against it, and with such moral support the number of defaulters is so large that it is quite impossible to employ the necessary means of compulsion. But this change is due, not to the so-called leaders of the people, but to the few individuals, especially those few boys under 18 years of age, just refusing to give way. Their resolution convinced the half-hearted and temporizing folk, who were shamed into action, to demand that democracy should not be carried on by such methods. It would indeed be a calamity if these new countries took on these discredited systems of the old world. While there is any group of people, however small, who refuse to be conscripted, the battle for freedom is not lost.

JOHN P. FLETCHER

LEISURE HOURS

Oh, pleasant are these leisure hours;
Through a window near my pine,
Light winds bring murmured prayers to me,
The prayers of monks, benign.

Oh, pleasant are these leisure hours;
The world is far away,
Its dust lies not upon my soul
This happy, sunny day.

Oh, pleasant are these leisure hours;
With window raised for me,
I sit until the shadow moves
Around my ancient tree.

—*Pei, Tieh.*

Translated from the Chinese by C. H. Chu.
Put into verse by R. M. K.

Canadian People to be Consulted Before War

The Hon. Arthur Meighen, leader of the Conservative Opposition in the Canadian Federal Parliament, is quoted by the press as having made the far reaching statement that the Canadian people will be consulted before Canada is again committed to war. This is a complete reversal of policy on the part of the conservative party. It is significant in view of the fact that it may well be that in 1926 the conservative party will be called upon to form the government at Ottawa. He said:

> We of the Conservative party have no idea, no knowledge, of another war. But we of the Conservative party believe that if another crisis should arise which might threaten our country —which we do not expect—this country should not send troops out of Canada without the people being consulted.

The press regards this as meaning, not that parliament should be consulted, but that the people at the polls should be appealed to. If the latter is true, then it is a remarkably forward step for the Conservative party to take. If the former, then also it is a complete reversal of their former policy.

That the statement is not a slip of the tongue is proven by the fact that Mr. Meighen first made this announcement at Hamilton, Ontario, to an English speaking audience, and repeated it on December 1st, in the Bagot constituency in Quebec before a French audience.

Quebec was opposed to Canadian participation in the last war, and was so much opposed to conscription that the Union Government, of which the Hon. Arthur Meighen was latterly premier, was unable to impose conscription on Quebec. It might therefore have been regarded as a bribe to Quebec had he not previously said the same thing in Ontario.

September 1922 vs. December 1925

How far reaching is this change of policy will be realized when the Bagot statement that "the *people* will be consulted", is compared with a statement made also by Mr. Meighen to the Toronto Business Men's Conservative Club in September 1922. He said then:

> Let there be no dispute as to where I stand. When Britain's message came, then Canada should have said; "Ready, aye ready; we stand by you". I hope the time has not gone by when that declaration can yet be made. If that declaration is made, then I will be at the back of the government. . . . . Can any one divine what is to be the result of a policy by which *we determine for ourselves* whether or not we leave to Britain, or share with her, the defence of treaties to which the honor as well as the signature of this country is pledged? Can anyone divine where it is going to lead us, or what will be the effect of the procrastination of this week we are passing through?

A liberal government was then in power. Lloyd George and Winston Churchill, had, on September 16th, issued to the Turkish government, without consultation with the British Cabinet, their remarkable manifesto, and on the following day they had called upon Canada to stand in readiness to help them at Constantinople. Premier King decided that action should not be taken on the mere call of the British Government, but that Canadian Parliament must be consulted. It was in protest against that appeal to the Canadian Parliament that Mr. Meighen placed himself so specifically on record.

It is significant that in September 1922 Mr. Meighen spoke as though the call had then come to defend the "Treaty of Sevres", a treaty that in fact had never been signed, and hence was non-existent. That fact was pointed out at the time in reply by Premier King.

If in fact the Conservative party has decided to appeal in future to the Canadian people at the polls, then it can be sure of the hearty support of all forward thinkers the world over. The effect would be in practice to practically eliminate war. If the conservatives have decided to consult parliament then it is a reversal of policy, but not a new thing in Canadian History.

Sir John A. Macdonald (Conservative), on March 12th, 1885, writing to the High Commissioner in London, took the ground that Canada was not obliged to take part in the wars of Empire. The Egyptian government was engaged in the suppression of the Sudanese Arabs and Britain asked Canada to send troops. Sir John replied suggestively:

" . . . . Why should we waste money and men in this wretched business". Then, Sir Wilfred Laurier on February 5th, 1900, when Britain was fighting the Boer war, said in Parliament:

> I claim for Canada this, that in the future Canada shall be at liberty to act, to interfere or not to interfere, to do just as she pleases, and that she shall reserve to herself the right to judge whether or not there is cause for her to act.

Even this did not mean that the parliament as such need be consulted. It would have been possible for the cabinet to have committed the nation on its own initiative. Hence the importance of the statement of the Hon. Arthur Meighen at this time.

The position of the Hon. Arthur Meighen in Sept. 1922 seemed to take for granted that Canada ought, without hesitation or investigation, to at once respond to the request of Great Britain for troops. His present position indicates that he considers that Canada is today a full fledged nation.

The action of Lloyd George and Churchill in 1922 proved that Sir Robert Borden is correct in the position he took in "Canadian Constitutional Studies" when he states that:

> The foreign policy of the British Government has been largely directed not by the Cabinet as a whole, but by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary. It does not appear that their colleagues were consulted except upon questions of great moment.

This being so it is important that the Canadian people should be consulted before they are plunged into war.

The Hon. Robert Borden when Premier of Canada stated that the right of Canada to accept or refuse to accept the Treaty of Versailles had been recognized by the British Government:

> It is recognized by the Crown of Great Britain that this Treaty must be submitted to the Canadian Parliament for its approval, and that we desire, we insist, upon the judgment of the Canadian Parliament in regard to it before we advise the King on behalf of Canada that the Treaty should be ratified. . .
>
> His (Mr. Fielding's) suggestion that the ratification by the Parliament of Canada is merely a farce, that the Government of the United Kingdom possesses such constitutional right in respect of this Dominion that they can impose their will upon us without regard to this parliament. I repeat that if such is the opinion of the hon. member he is thinking in terms of a hundred years ago and not of today.

Canada thus has the power to declare war and to make peace. Though a Dominion of the British Empire, she still has the rights of a sovereign nation. If the statement of Mr. Meighen that the people will be consulted before war is declared is actually carried into effect, then Canada will be the first nation in the world that has decided so to consult its people.

Winnipeg, Canada WILLIAM IVENS

The Abraham Lincoln Centre Ideal

Abraham Lincoln Centre is the embodiment of an ideal, or rather a set of ideals. It is a working model of a divine faith in humanity, in religion, and in social democracy; in humanity—beneath race and nationality, in religion beyond creed and church, in democracy above individual and competitive ways.

I. Abraham Lincoln Centre stands for cosmopolitanism. In theory many movements are cosmopolitan, but not many are actually so. Most people are bound hand and foot by the chains of social bigotry. The "Nordic" is only one of many racial myths; but Lincoln Centre will have none of this racial myth-making. It stands for the humanity beneath all races. This uncompromising stand for cosmopolitanism is both weakness and strength. It is the strength of a spiritual ideal but it is a difficult ideal for many people to uphold. The fact that cosmopolitanism is a difficult ideal and that comparatively few people are willing to uphold it, is all the more reason why those who do affirm it should unfalteringly support it.

II. Abraham Lincoln Centre stands for world religion. Among the speakers, lecturers, teachers, and pupils of Lincoln Centre are adherents of many faiths, also some of no church affiliation. Lincoln Centre does not ask whether one is Jew or Christian, orthodox or heterodox, believer or non-believer. It finds essential religion in all churches and in no church. It was the founder of Lincoln Centre, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, who organized the "World's Parliament of Religions" in 1893. The cause of religion, unrimmed by sect and creed and race, always commanded his first allegiance. Lincoln Centre hears gladly the voice of the prophet irrespective of his label. This also is both weakness and strength: weakness, in that bigotry and intolerance still wield a wicked sword; strength, in that religion, is mighty and will prevail.

III. Abraham Lincoln Centre stands for experimental democracy. Experimental democracy involves three things: (1) freedom of investigation, (2) social idealism, and (3) the co-operative spirit.

The truth is not always obvious. It must sometimes be sought after with skill and diligence. Hence, the necessity for free speech, free press, and free assembly. Lincoln Centre takes the "Bill of Rights" seriously, and provides a Friday Morning Forum where experts are utterly free to present the results of investigations in their several fields. Sometimes the speaker is a deposed Bishop, again he is a Bishop in good and regular standing; sometimes he is a careful scientist, again he is a reformer flaming with zeal; sometimes he is an alert philosopher, again he is a genius in social technique. But free discussion is not for its own sake, though that alone would justify it.

Abraham Lincoln Centre is socially idealistic. It believes in brotherhood and the practical implications of brotherhood. It believes that things that should be, can be. To it, hope is substance and visions are evidence of things yet to be seen.

But freedom and idealism, though basic and dynamic, are incomplete without co-operation. Hence, Lincoln Centre seeks to maintain inter-racial, international, and inter-religious sympathy and insight.

Experimentalism, too, is strength and weakness; weakness in that many want social fixity, strength in that well-grounded ideals are always the realities that endure.

This, then, is the Lincoln Centre ideal. To the old friends, let it be said that this ideal has been maintained through great trials and tribulations, by the sacrifices of great and good souls. At times the clouds have hung low but always the star has pierced the gloom. To others of kindred mind, let it be said that Lincoln Centre extends an invitation to a great adventure, difficult but challenging, leading to a land not fully discerned but one full of radiant hope. CURTIS W. REESE

Moments

"Queen of the Market" is my lady of the moment!

Surrounded by the comb-man, who has thousands of combs on the sidewalk; by the eloquent seller of trousers and shirts, who holds each article against his corpulent form; by the thin and scrawny woman of seventy, with hair closely pinned back and basque tightly fitted, selling cotton of every color; by the thick, lumpy man holding filmy lace scarfs on his dirty fingers—amongst all these and others stood the "Queen of the Market."

"Pots, pans, kettles!" were screamed by a hawker who should have lost his voice ere this. He screamed the words from toothless jaws, accenting the last syllable almost deafeningly. An odor of stale fish drew our attention to the fish stall. All about stood purchasers spell-bound by the varied wares. So much stuff for so little money!

And amongst this crowd we stood, lost in wonder—we, who had left our hotel bent on a quiet morning spent in the fragrant hills of Rapello!

We turned to go, but the Queen of the Market's sharp eye caught us. There she stood—arms akimbo—selling, or offering for sale, gentlemen's handkerchiefs, large, coarse, bright cotton ones. Her sales tables were two tremendous cotton umbrellas (one blue with yellow border, the other red with brown edge) turned upside down. From the hundreds of handkerchiefs, she picked up one, holding it as high as her fat arm could reach, shouting "Una lira, l'una. Una lira, l'una!"

Two hundred and fifty pounds, at least, in weight, her feet squeezed into high-heeled gray suede shoes, and gray silk stockings, she strode majestically from one umbrella to the other. Her short black alpaca skirt was surmounted by a shirred chiffon blouse and a faded black silk sleeveless coat, which hung in long points over the hips. Around her ample neck two gold chains hung from which dangled many pendants and a safety pin. A much-bejewelled ring on her fat forefinger and diamond earrings swinging emphatically set off to advantage her moon-like face, but red from her professional scream, "Una lira, l'una, Una lira, l'una!" With utmost satisfaction her mouth snapped after each word, her lower lip curling upward, almost to her nose. Her head-dress, a marvelous coal black drapery, was knotted at the neck and fastened on the forehead with a diamond pin.

In her voice was the strength of the hills, and long reverberations followed us as we made our climb and turned, once more, to see one hand on her hip—the other high in the air:

"Una lira, l'una. Una lira, l'una!" F. A. S.

THE STUDY TABLE

A Galsworthian Drama

This play* is to be grouped neither with the best nor yet with the worst of Galsworthy's writings for the stage. It is certainly much better than the last play to come from Galsworthy's pen, "The Forest"; but on the other hand it by no means measures up to "Loyalties" and "The Skin Game," to say nothing of certain earlier plays like "Strife" and "The Pigeon." Yet it is typical beyond almost any other play that we can recall. It is pure Galsworthy in its technique, in its artistry, and especially in its *motif* which, as always, is the analysis of a problem pregnant with individual and social ill.

In this case the problem is the public exploitation of private tragedy through the medium of the police and the press. A famous English flying-man has committed suicide the night before the beginning of the drama. The rise of the curtain reveals detectives and newspaper men at work. In the course of the investigation secret scandals are unearthed involving more or less innocent members of four separate families. Everything is made public before the coroner's jury and in the columns of the newspapers, to no imaginable purpose. Individuals are shamed, the dead defamed, souls scarred forever with the wounds of torture, to no good end, and with no result other than a grand "show" for the vulgar entertainment of the mob.

As always with such questions as this, Galsworthy asks, Why; and, as always, he gives no answer. He is content to state the problem and leave us to understand and if possible to act. As a play, "The Show" is handled with consummate art. No point is missed, no lesson either under- or over-stressed. The drama lacks, however, the bigness of "Strife" and "The Mob," it plunges to no such depths of pity as "Justice," and it displays no such abundant human interest as "Loyalties." Thoroughly characteristic and admirably done, it is still a distinctly lesser work in the catalogue of Galsworthy's masterpieces.

J. H. H.

Race Prejudice**

For seventy-five cents the man or woman interested in race relations can secure a volume of as brilliant a set of anecdotes as one is likely ever to find on this subject. Besides the 194 stories, he will find searching questions under each heading, questions that will oblige him to think. The book is compiled by the National Conference on the Christian Way of Life, and should find its way into every Christian Church, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. It is an earnest effort to get people who accept the Christian doctrine of brotherhood to see how race prejudice runs counter to it. And this is done by presenting a series of most interesting short tales.

The chapters deal with Understandings and Misunderstandings, Civic, Economic, Educational and Social Handicaps, Non-Adjustment and Mal-Adjustment. As an example: The chapter on Civic Handicaps takes up the law, and under the heading, "In the Courts" we have eight stories of race discrimination. Of the eight six are Negroes, one Greek and one Portuguese. The Portuguese story is a long one and as flagrant an example of injustice as any one of those told of the Negro. And after the stories come questions, for this is a sort of textbook. "Is it an accepted American theory that the life and happiness of a colored person is worth less in so far as financial compensation comes into question, than those of a white person? Is there a similar theory concerning the life and happiness of immigrants? Does the sense of being discriminated against by the law have an important influence on race attitudes? Does it increase criminality?"

No story in the book is more dramatic than that of the colored officers at Camp Pike, Arkansas, and their conversion of their Captain from a Negro hater to a lover of his men. There is an interesting study of the prejudice against Jews in hotels, and by its side the story of the Negro thrown out of the elevator at a national conference in Washington. (Hotels, by the way, as they are growing to be run by corporations, not men, are growing worse, not better.) And then comes the question: "Is the treatment of the Negro explained by the same reasons that account for that of the Jews? Were the hotel proprietors' reasons for excluding Jews and making it unpleasant for Negroes good from the point of view of business?" and so on.

Perhaps I lay overmuch emphasis on the questions, but we are all so given to treating the subject of race emotionally, to shrieking our convictions at one another, that I enjoy this effort to see our question steadily and see it whole. For it is a whole and few are those who can read this story of prejudice and find that they have no cause for self-reproach. Not only the white but the Negro knows prejudice. It may be against the Japanese or the West Indian, but there it is. And this book bids us look it squarely in the face and sternly to question ourselves.

The volume closes with an appeal to every reader and every discussion group to furnish to *The Inquiry* a report upon their study of the outline. Suggestions are given as to how to send this report. Read the book and then yourself send in your major findings. By so doing, you will help *The Inquiry* and you will help yourself to clearer thinking.

MARY WHITE OVINGTON.

The Gentle Art of War

Messrs. Moss and Lang have given us an excellent volume,‡ succinct, colorful and naked. The "Manual of Military Training" is the greatest argument for pacifism ever published.

The Manual is a paragon of honesty. There are in it no rationalizing attempts to show that military training is desirable because of physical benefit to the individual, or because of the cultivation of discipline. Such efforts at justification are left to weak-minded College professors. The Manual declares, first in bold type and later in italics: *"The object of all military training is to win battles."*

It is fashionable for military maniacs to refer to war as a game. The Manual is more honest. "The principles of sportsmanship and consideration for your opponent," it blurts out, "have no place in the practical

* *The Show*, by John Galsworthy. Published by Scribners, New York.

** "And Who Is My Neighbor?" An Outline for the Study of Race Relations in America. By the Commission on Race Relations of *The Inquiry*. Published by *The Inquiry*, 129 East 52nd St., New York City.

‡ "Manual of Military Training," by Col. James A. Moss, U. S. A., and Major John W. Lang, U. S. A. Published by George Banta Publishing Co., Menasha, Wis.

application of this work." And in the development of this thesis our authors are positively fascinating.

To finish an opponent who hangs on, or attempts to pull you to the ground, always try to break his hold by driving the knee or foot to his crotch and gouging his eyes with your thumbs.

This last after a couple of pages of similar delicacies.

In their treatment of bayonet fighting, which they consider "the deciding factor in every assault," Messrs. Moss and Lang again effervesce.

Bayonet fighting is possible only because red-blooded men naturally possess the fighting instinct. This inherent desire to fight and kill must be carefully watched for and encouraged by the instructor.

It is disconcerting to note that "Men still have fight in them after you stick them unless you hit a vital spot. . . ." But how reassuring is the continuation of that sentence. ". . . But when the bayonet comes out and the air sucks in and they begin to bleed on the inside they feel the pain and lose their fight." That phrase "when the bayonet comes out" is a sleeper, we discovered. We always used to take it for granted that putting it in was the hard part. Now the manual tells us that frequently the bayonet gets caught in the opponent's guts and it becomes necessary to shoot said opponent apart, "to break up the obstruction."

For that matter we are learning many new things. We used to have an idea that it was heroic and beautiful and glorious to save a stricken comrade's life on the field of battle. But we've been disillusioned.

When officers and men belonging to fighting troops leave their proper places to carry back or to care for wounded during the progress of action they are guilty of skulking. This offense must be oppressed with utmost vigor.

In sheer dramatic force, the manual is good. Sentences like "Few bayonet wounds come to the attention of the surgeon," are models of compactness. But our authors' sporadic excursions into the field of humor are flops. Their devilishness is pathetic when, for instance, they divulge with a scandalized chuckle, "It is said that with intimate friends Mrs. Grant usually referred to the general as Mr. Grant (instead of the General)."

To those of us who await The Great American Novel, who long for a piece of literature that shall adequately express twentieth century life and culture, who search for the literary quintessence of the achievements of Nordic civilization, we do earnestly recommend, Moss and Lang's "Manual of Military Training."

F. C. S.

Tabloid Reviews

"Modern Turkey," by Eliot Grinnell Mears. Macmillen Co., New York.

A sober presentation of the underlying politico-economic life of Turkey, including chapters on government, press, land tenure, agriculture, commerce, the status of women, etc.

"The Science of Biology," by Geo. G. Scott. Thos. Y. Crowell Co., New York.

A lucid, comprehensive, systematic, well-illustrated study of the biology of plants, animals and man.

"Our Unitarian Heritage," by Earl Morse Wilbur. The Beacon Press, Boston.

A brief, readable and thrilling history of Unitarian thought from the 16th Century Anabaptists, Italian Humanists, Socinians, and the Unitarians of Transylvania down to the present-day Unitarians to whom "the works of true religion are spiritual freedom, enlightened reason, broad and tolerant sympathy, upright character and unselfish service."

"The Liberal Gospel," by Charles H. Lyttle. The Beacon Press, Boston.

An instructive sketch of the life of Channing, with selected readings from his works.

"The Economy of Human Energy," by Thomas Nixon Carner. Macmillan Co., New York.

An exposition of the abundant life in terms of human energy realized through competitive productivity.

"The Minister's Everyday Life," by Lloyd C. Douglas. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.

Delicate yet racy instruction on practical matters to ambitious theologues, and not without meaning to the more mature of the clergy.

"The Psychology of Inspiration," by Geo. Lansing Raymond. Funk and Wagnalls Co., New York.

An argument for the "suggestive," not "dictatorial," nature of the Bible. A good book for Fundamentalists to read.

"The Reasonableness of Christianity," by Douglass Clyde Macintosh. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.

An attempt to establish the claim that Christianity is founded on the normality and reasonableness of moral optimism and the essentially repeatable and verifiable nature of Christian experience, independently of the uncertainties of historical investigation.

"Man and the Attainment of Immortality," by James Y. Simpson. Geo. H. Doran Co., New York.

A denial of the inherent immortality of the soul and an affirmation of the attainability of immortality through right relationship with God.

"The Relation Between Science and Theology," by C. Stuart Gager. The Open Court Pub. Co., Chicago.

A clear statement of the spirit and method of science and a gentle suggestion that evolutionists should leave the question of ultimate destiny to the theologians.

CURTIS W. REESE.

A STRANGER IN SCYTHOPOLIS

Eager he wandered the streets of Scythopolis,
A Hebrew youth, with the dust of twoscore miles
Staining his sandals, dark eyes dancing with bliss
Of beauty,—arches and pillars and peristyles,
Porticos, domes and many an edifice
Noble in line and color. And ever the passers-by turned
And spake with him till their hearts within them burned.

Simple his words, sounded with rustic burr
Of the Galilaean, but he was himself the Word
Of God's own joy, and each leaf-crowned reveller
Moved on to a music in heart he had not heard
Since, a child, he danced with the wind. The sophister,
Even the cynic whose sneers had beaten on life like whips,
Marvelled to find sweet laughter on their lips.

Beggars that crouched in the streets of Scythopolis,
Lean hands plucking at togas that swept them by,
Let pass his scrip too humble for avarice,
But it fed them with fruits as in limitless supply,
Figs, dates, olives, that thrilled the paralysis
From spirit and nerve till, arising, the happy lame walked free,
Till the bewildered blind cried out, "I see!"

Before a sculptured Diana in Parian
Marble the prentice carpenter drew quick breath
Of rapture. From her litter a courtesan
Beheld him standing like one that worshippeth
And cowered back on her perfumed pillows, wan,
Smit by the silver shaft of chastity. Over him flew
Doves like a halo of wings against the blue.

Why were forbidden the streets of Scythopolis,
Wondered the young Nazarene as he lingered in them.
Were not Beauty and Mirth the angels of this
City more splendid than holy Jerusalem?
He knew by the Voice within him that not amiss
Had he done that day in seeking the glories of Roman and Greek,
Though he knew not yet that to him should the Gentiles seek.

KATHARINE LEE BATES.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

LIBERAL ACTIVITIES

The Association to Abolish War, 7 Wellington Terrace, Brookline, Mass., has issued a pamphlet by Charles F. Dole, "Will Conscription Destroy War?" 5 cents.

This is opportune, for the army and navy are preparing a new draft law for the present Congress. In it is the provision that those persons who have conscientious scruples against participation in war need not fight but must serve in non-combatant capacities. To put themselves on record, conscientious objectors should sign the War Resister's International pledge now.

The American Civil Liberties Union reports that 118 members of the I. W. W. have been taken from jail with the connivance of Cass County, North Dakota, officials, beaten and deported to Minnesota. These are the men arrested for riding freight cars, or taken by a raid in the I. W. W. hall in Fargo during August.

The Centralia Publicity Committee, 825 North Tower Ave., Centralia, Washington, reports that a majority of the jurors who convicted the I. W. W., when they resisted the raid upon their hall, have petitioned the Governor to pardon eight of the men who are serving terms of 25 to 40 years.

The Trade Union Committee for Organizing Negro Workers, 2380 Seventh Avenue, New York City, is appealing for funds on the ground that if Negroes are not taken into labor unions they will continue to be used as strike-breakers.

The Searchlight points out the peculiar discrepancy that when the surtax maximum rate was 72 per cent in 1921 the highest incomes paid an average of 63.59 per cent; that when the maximum rate was 50 per cent in 1922 the highest incomes paid only an average of 35.02 per cent and the next year with the same rates only 23.53 per cent.

New York Federation of Progressive Women, 25 West 43rd Street, has published an admirable pamphlet containing questions and answers on the comparative merits of public and private ownership of industry.

The League for Industrial Democracy has issued a pamphlet "What is Industrial Democracy?" by Norman Thomas. The twentieth anniversary dinner was held December 30. It is too late for the dinner but the pamphlet may be obtained for 15 cents.

The N. Y. Commercial, reviewing the aims of the I. W. W., said: "Yet with all this—with the mass of accumulated evidence as to acts of sabotage, destruction, rioting and killing promoted by the I. W. W., it has the backing and support of the American Civil Liberties Union. From this, one is forced to draw the conclusion that the A.C.L.U. approves of the methods, purposes and acts of members of the I. W. W. Then from this conclusion there can follow of necessity but one further conclusion—that the A. C. L. U. is not an organization in the interest of Labor; that it is not American in its purpose and work; and that in its work it is doing what it can to advance this and other movements which are seeking the overthrow of this Government, the confiscation of all industries and the destruction of private property rights."

The answer is that the American Civil Liberties Union has done nothing to overthrow the Constitution of the United States, but has protested against the acts of Government that are contrary to both the spirit and letter of the Declaration of Independence that values human rights above property rights.

The Special Senate Committee, of which Senator Couzens is chairman, has published its findings that large corporations have been permitted to evade taxes with the approval of Secretary of the Treasury Mellon. Anaconda Copper Company saved $2,500,000 and the Mellon National Bank about $91,000. What will be done to Couzens this time? When he started his revelations last year the Government tried to mulct him out of $10,000,000 for extra tax on a transaction it had approved some years before.

The International Committee for Political Prisoners has appealed to Soviet Russia to modify its treatment of political prisoners imprisoned or exiled for their opinions. "We address the Soviet Government with this statement and appeal because we look to a government based on new conceptions of human relationships to set an example in humanity."

It will be interesting to see which country, Russia or the United States, responds first to the plea for liberty of opinion.—*The Arbitrator.*

LEAGUE FOR THE ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A National Organization

Do you believe in the old Mosaic law—an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life?

You do not.

Yet forty of our forty-eight states still execute criminals.

Fifteen kill them by electrocution. Thirty-three still hang them. One State, Utah, gives them the choice of being shot or hung. One State, Nevada, kills them with lethal gas.

More than one hundred persons a year are executed in this country. This is a low estimate, since many states with a high execution rate can not furnish statistics. Some states execute by county, and have no State figures. These are for the most part southern states where the execution rate is high.

Of the one hundred and more victims, the large majority are between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four years. These are not our figures; they are the figures of statisticians. Scientists claim a man has not attained his full mental growth before the age of thirty.

The death penalty falls almost invariably on the poor and helpless. The wealthy and powerful, those who can muster attorneys and influence, escape. Capital punishment as an institution has thus made a mockery of justice and the jury system.

Abolition of the death penalty is not a new experiment. There is less crime in the abolition states than in those that still kill criminals. The states that have abolished capital punishment are Michigan (1847); Rhode Island (1852); Wisconsin (1853); Kansas (1872); Maine (1887); Minnesota (1911); North and South Dakota (1915).

Largely as a result of war hysteria and reaction 4 states (Arizona, Missouri, Oregon and Washington), which had abolished capital punishment, re-established the death penalty in 1919-1920.

Yet the demand for the abolition of capital punishment is growing. Thirteen states since 1917 have sought to abolish capital punishment: Ohio, Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, Colorado, Utah, Vermont, Massachusetts, Indiana, Nebraska, Delaware, New Hampshire and New York.

These campaigns failed. Why?

Only a national organization can unite the friends of abolition in every State to CONCENTRATE ITS ATTACK and thus make new gains. Only a national organization can safeguard legislation already won. Only a national organization with watchful friends in every State can combat hysteria, race prejudice, newspaper clamor over "crime waves"—in short, all the forces that make for reaction.

Help us to wipe out capital punishment in every State! We are campaigning this year in New York State and preparing campaigns in California, Illinois and in the District of Columbia. Every campaign we win will release friends and funds for other States. Join today and be an active worker! Write or telephone the National Office for information:

League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment
70 Fifth Ave., New York.

TO THE FRIENDS AND WELL-WISHERS OF RUSSIAN CHILDREN

The *Russky Golos,* a Russian langauge daily in New York City, has started a fund for the John Reed Colony at Alexeivka, Russia. It is believed that at least $2,000 can be raised without doubt, but many persons interested think quite a little more can be had by co-operation of those Americans, who have shown such

---

OPPOSED TO ENLARGING UNITY

Editor of Unity:

I noticed your appeal for Christmas presents. Send one subscription today and hope to send more.

I noted also that in previous issues the promise was made to enlarge the size of the paper.

Please don't! I think one of its greatest good features is that it is short enough to be read.

If it was smaller, and people would read some of the articles 2 or 3 times, it would be still better, to my mind. It is the steady "drop" of water that makes a hole in the stone not the bucket full.

I also wish to correct a mistake in a recent issue. Writing about Charley Chaplin, Jazz, etc. The editor claims to be a minority of one, which is not correct. I have held the same opinion for years and have said it loud from time to time, going even further and coining the phrase: "To make all the bricks, to build all the Lunatic Asylums to put all the Lunatics in (who are now at large) would be the greatest business ever!"

So please keep UNITY short and crisp and see that the office cat does not fall asleep on her job of preventing blunders getting into the press.

With very best wishes, Sincerely yours,

Leonia, N. J. PETER FIEBIGER

great sympathy for the Russian children. American aid for Russia, especially for her children, arouses profound sympathy and appreciation among Russians, as you know.

The owners and editors of the Golos are preparing an entertainment in aid of the Fund and a company of Russian actresses and actors, and other individual artists have volunteered their services. It is hoped to have Miss Anna Louise Strong, head of the John Reed Colony make a personal appeal to the Russians here, but as she may not be in the city before the middle of February, an effort is being made to have her send a message to them.

The *Golos* is making daily reports on the Fund and will have special Sunday articles about the Colony, with illustrations.

I am simply a member of the New York John Reed Colony and wish to let you know of the Fund as you may not have heard of it.

The *Golos* raised $2,000 for Russian children, after Lenin's death and the Amalgamated Bank then sent each thousand dollars free, thus contributing $78 each time. Most of this sum was contributed by children, women, men and families, who had little money to spare. It seems as if $5,000 could be had this time.

Yours sincerely,
T. F. MEADE
35 Morton St., New York City.

(But please don't send me any money.) Send to

Russky Golos
64 East Seventh St.
New York City.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Beacon Press, 25 Beacon St., Boston:

The Liberal Gospel—as set forth in the writings of William Ellery Channing. Edited by Charles H. Lyttle.

Our Unitarian Heritage. An introduction to the history of the Unitarian Movement. By Earl Morse Wilbur.

T. Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Ave., Cor. 27th St., New York:

Ethics in Theory and Application. By Horatio W. Dresser.

Dr. Charles F. Dole's
16-Page Pamphlet
"Will Conscription Destroy War?"
A discussion of principles
5 cents each; 10 for 25 cents; postpaid
THE ASSOCIATION TO ABOLISH WAR
7 Wellington Terrace BROOKLINE, MASS

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
3913 Cottage Grove
Tel., Atlantic 1876

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Monroe 6940 732 W. Van Buren St., CHICAGO

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!
Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.
Insist on
BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

DREXEL State Bank
Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.
Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .
Your savings and checking account cordially invited
Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Subscribe for and read UNITY
224

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM
DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office 608 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

JANUARY
Preparations for a trip south, or a continuation of Winter Social Activities at home, suggest that you save expense thru the cleansing of your garments by our new system of continuous clarification.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORK
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue